

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-14, and 17-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 4-5, 15-16, and 20-43 were previously cancelled. Claims 14 and 17-19 have been amended herein to correct minor typographical errors. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11-14, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as assertedly being anticipated by Tran (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0073269, hereinafter “Tran”). Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Tran as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Yu (U.S. Patent No. 6,686,248, hereinafter “Yu”). Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Tran. Claims 6 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Tran as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Paton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,873,051, hereinafter “Paton”). Claims 8 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Tran as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Holmes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,797,641, hereinafter “Holmes”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP § 2131. In this case, Applicants’ claims 1 and 13 each recite at least one feature not shown in Tran. In particular, Applicants’ claim 1 recites the limitation, “the first structure being fully silicided,” and Applicants’ claim 13 recites the limitation, “a fully silicided gate electrode.”

The Office Action asserts that the silicide region 15 of Tran discloses these features. This is incorrect. The silicide region 15 is only a portion of the gate structure 18 and is formed over the polycrystalline silicon 14. (See, *e.g.*, Tran, [0026].) It should be noted that the polycrystalline silicon 14 is not silicided, and thus, the gate structure 18 is not fully silicided. Because the gate structure 18 is not fully silicided as required by Applicants' claims 1 and 13, Tran fails to teach each and every element of Applicants' claims, and thus, Tran fails to anticipate Applicants' claims 1 and 13.

Claims 2-3, 6-12, 14, and 17-19 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Roger C. Knapp, Applicants' attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

May 11, 2007  
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Roger C. Knapp/  
Roger C. Knapp  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 46,836